

Review of compliance

Shooting Star CHASE Shooting Star House	
Region:	London
Location address:	The Avenue Hampton Middlesex TW12 3RA
Type of service:	Hospice services
Date of Publication:	April 2012
Overview of the service:	<p>Shooting Star House is a hospice for children. It is provided by Shooting Star Chase, which is a registered charity that provides another children's hospice in the South East.</p> <p>The hospice provides ongoing care and support for children with life limiting conditions, and end of life care. Children can stay overnight at the hospice, attend the day care service, and receive the</p>

	'hospice at home' service. Counselling and support is available for parents and siblings.
--	---

Summary of our findings for the essential standards of quality and safety

Our current overall judgement

Shooting Star House was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety.

The summary below describes why we carried out this review, what we found and any action required.

Why we carried out this review

We carried out this review as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews.

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, carried out a visit on 24 February 2012, observed how people were being cared for, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

There were limited numbers of people using the service at the time of the inspection. The people we did speak with were positive about the service.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Shooting Star House was meeting them

Outcome 01: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run

Children and their parents are generally treated with dignity and respect, and offered choices about their care.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights

Children in the hospice are well cared for and their families are supported.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights

The hospice has processes in place to protect people from abuse, and to respond to any potential safeguarding concerns.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 14: Staff should be properly trained and supervised, and have the chance to develop and improve their skills

People receive care from appropriately trained and supported staff.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care

The hospice has processes in place for monitoring the quality of the service provided. People using the service are able to contribute towards this.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Other information

Please see previous reports for more information about previous reviews.

**What we found
for each essential standard of quality
and safety we reviewed**

The following pages detail our findings and our regulatory judgement for each essential standard and outcome that we reviewed, linked to specific regulated activities where appropriate.

We will have reached one of the following judgements for each essential standard.

Compliant means that people who use services are experiencing the outcomes relating to the essential standard.

A **minor concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard.

A **moderate concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and there is an impact on their health and wellbeing because of this.

A **major concern** means that people who use services are not experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and are not protected from unsafe or inappropriate care, treatment and support.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary improvements are made. Where there are a number of concerns, we may look at them together to decide the level of action to take.

More information about each of the outcomes can be found in the *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*

Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- * Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
- * Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
- * Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
- * Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

One parent we spoke with told us that the service was "brilliant" and they were very happy with the care provided to their child. All children had their own room, and these were decorated when children were admitted with age-appropriate decorations and pictures.

We saw positive interactions between the staff and the children. Staff were patient with the children and treated them with respect. The children appeared to be enjoying themselves and expressed excitement at being in the centre.

Other evidence

We saw that staff worked together to support the children, and offered the children choices about what they wanted to do. The care records were written in a person centred way, and showed that the children and their families had been involved in planning their care.

We saw posters and information leaflets on display in the hospice, and there was a suggestion box for visitors to post comments and feedback.

Our judgement

Children and their parents are generally treated with dignity and respect, and offered choices about their care.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

The parents we spoke with said the children were well cared for. They said the staff were friendly and responsive, and tried to make their child's stay at the hospice as enjoyable as possible.

The hospice was decorated in a bright and child-friendly way. There were various activity areas which included a sensory room, music room, swimming pool, and a 'chill-out room' for teenagers. There were age-appropriate toys, games and books for both teenagers and younger children. We saw photographs on the wall of children taking part in activities.

Other evidence

The care records showed that all the children had had an assessment of their needs, and care plans implemented. Computer and paper records showed that the children's care needs were regularly reviewed. Risk assessments had been carried out, and the hospice had communicated with other healthcare professionals involved in the children's care.

Counselling and support was provided for the parents and siblings of children using the service. Families were able to stay in the hospice with their child. There was a dedicated area for families which included bedrooms with ensuite facilities, a kitchen and lounge. Food and drinks were provided for the children, their families and staff in the communal dining area. There was a separate suite for bereaved families.

Care was provided by a mixture of paediatric nurses, general nurses with paediatric experience, nursery nurses and support workers. There was also an activity co-ordinator, music therapists, a physiotherapist, an occupational therapist, and a visiting GP. The hospice had volunteers who provided additional care and support services to the children and their parents. The hospice had processes in place for the safe management and administration of medication.

The Sparkles Day Centre provided activities and support for children four days a week. The children had one-to-one care during their stay. The day care service provided an activity programme, which was also open to children staying overnight in the hospice. Some children who were in the hospice during the week, attended school from the hospice. Others were taught from the National Curriculum, by a teacher who worked in the hospice three days a week.

We spoke with staff who provided the 'hospice at home' service, but did not directly review the care provided.

Our judgement

Children in the hospice are well cared for and their families are supported.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are respected and upheld.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

A parent we spoke with said it felt safe for the children there, and they were able to talk to staff if they had any concerns.

Other evidence

The home had safeguarding processes in place. The hospice and its grounds had restricted access, and staff told us that each child had a carer with them most of the time when they were awake.

Staff said that they had had safeguarding training, and told us what they would do if they were concerned about a child. Staff described a safeguarding concern and how it had been addressed. Staff told us that they felt able to discuss any concerns they had. Minutes of meetings showed that safeguarding concerns had been discussed.

Our judgement

The hospice has processes in place to protect people from abuse, and to respond to any potential safeguarding concerns.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 14: Supporting staff

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by competent staff.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 14: Supporting staff

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

The parents we spoke with said that the staff were very skilled and supportive. The interactions we observed between staff and children were positive.

Other evidence

The staff we spoke with were generally positive about working in the hospice, and thought that the children and their families received a good standard of care. Some staff said that it had been difficult during the merger with another hospice, and felt that change had been imposed on them. However, most staff said that this disruption caused by the merger had now settled down. Most of the staff we spoke with said they felt supported in their work.

The staff we spoke with said they had had all their mandatory training which included resuscitation, fire, and safeguarding. Many staff had also had additional training such as working with bereaved families, and caring for a ventilated child. Training is carried out onsite and we saw that, for example, baby and child sized resuscitation dolls were available for staff to learn and practice their skills.

Staff told us that the hospice has a competency based system to ensure that they are skilled to provide care. Records confirmed this, and showed that staff completed some self-directed learning and were then assessed as being competent before they were allowed to carry out an activity alone. This covered a range of areas which included caring for children with a tracheotomy or on a ventilator, and managing a shift.

Staff told us that they received one-to-one and group supervision and found this helpful.

All the staff we spoke with said that they received supervision.

Staff told us that there were some vacancies for nurses and support workers. They said a temporary 'bank' of staff were used to cover gaps, but there were generally enough staff on duty.

Our judgement

People receive care from appropriately trained and supported staff.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support, due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

One parent described an occasion when they had given feedback to the hospice about an improvement to the service, and this had been responded to and implemented. There was a comments box in a prominent position in the main dining area.

Other evidence

Records showed that the hospice had processes for reviewing the quality of the service, responding to concerns, and making improvements. Minutes of meetings showed that a number of audits were carried out which included medication and the quality of care records. The findings of audits, and any necessary actions, were discussed and monitored as were incidents and complaints, staffing levels and training, and clinical issues and practice developments.

In April 2011 the service carried out a 'scoping project' to identify areas for improvement and to provide a consistent approach following the forthcoming merger with another children's hospice. The project involved talking to families, and covered all areas of the service. The findings were that feedback was generally positive, but there were areas for improvement and development.

We saw an incident log which showed that incidents were recorded and staff responded to them. We saw an example of how an incident had been responded to in detail. We saw an example of a complaint which had been responded to appropriately.

Our judgement

The hospice has processes in place for monitoring the quality of the service provided. People using the service are able to contribute towards this.

Overall, we found that Shooting Star House was meeting this essential standard.

What is a review of compliance?

By law, providers of certain adult social care and health care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has written guidance about what people who use services should experience when providers are meeting essential standards, called *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*.

CQC licenses services if they meet essential standards and will constantly monitor whether they continue to do so. We formally review services when we receive information that is of concern and as a result decide we need to check whether a service is still meeting one or more of the essential standards. We also formally review them at least every two years to check whether a service is meeting all of the essential standards in each of their locations. Our reviews include checking all available information and intelligence we hold about a provider. We may seek further information by contacting people who use services, public representative groups and organisations such as other regulators. We may also ask for further information from the provider and carry out a visit with direct observations of care.

When making our judgements about whether services are meeting essential standards, we decide whether we need to take further regulatory action. This might include discussions with the provider about how they could improve. We only use this approach where issues can be resolved quickly, easily and where there is no immediate risk of serious harm to people.

Where we have concerns that providers are not meeting essential standards, or where we judge that they are not going to keep meeting them, we may also set improvement actions or compliance actions, or take enforcement action:

Improvement actions: These are actions a provider should take so that they **maintain** continuous compliance with essential standards. Where a provider is complying with essential standards, but we are concerned that they will not be able to maintain this, we ask them to send us a report describing the improvements they will make to enable them to do so.

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. Where a provider is not meeting the essential standards but people are not at immediate risk of serious harm, we ask them to send us a report that says what they will do to make sure they comply. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action to make sure that essential standards are met.

Enforcement action: These are actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers are set out in the law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

Information for the reader

Document purpose	Review of compliance report
Author	Care Quality Commission
Audience	The general public
Further copies from	03000 616161 / www.cqc.org.uk
Copyright	Copyright © (2010) Care Quality Commission (CQC). This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part, free of charge, in any format or medium provided that it is not used for commercial gain. This consent is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and on proviso that it is not used in a derogatory manner or misleading context. The material should be acknowledged as CQC copyright, with the title and date of publication of the document specified.

Care Quality Commission

Website	www.cqc.org.uk
Telephone	03000 616161
Email address	enquiries@cqc.org.uk
Postal address	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA